



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,881	02/27/2002	Nina Lewis	255/220	7270

23639 7590 10/19/2005
BINGHAM, MCCUTCHEN LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER
18 FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-4067

EXAMINER

PATEL, CHIRAG R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2141

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/084,881	LEWIS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chirag R. Patel	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on August 22, 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on August 22, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The discussion of the amended claims is discussed below with reference to Beckman et al. (US 6,385,724)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Beckman et al. (US 6,385,724)

As per claims 1, 19, and 37, Beckman et al. discloses a method for linking between nodes in a distributed computing system, the method comprising:

implementing a domain comprising a first network node and a second network node; (Col 6 lines 47-59, Figure 5A, Figure 5B)

Art Unit: 2141

implementing a data object that indicates, before a link is established between the first and second network nodes, whether the domain permits links between nodes without verification of user credential; (Col 14 lines 43-59, Figure 11)

sending a link request from the first network node to the second network node; (Col 8 lines 48-51, Figure 5A items 302, 312)

establishing the link between the first network node and the second network node without requiring the user credentials if the data object indicates verification of the user credentials is not required; (Col 11 line 62, Col 12 lines 42-45)

As per claims 2, 20, and 38, Beckman et al. discloses the method of claim 1 in which a connected user makes the link request, and the link is established as a connected user; (Col 11 lines 62-67, Col 12 lines 20-24).

As per claims 3, 21, and 39, Beckman et al. discloses the method of claim 1 in which a connected user makes the link request as a current user, and the link is established as a current user; An object can access the functionality of another object in a different context, and this provides a reference to a security policy; The teachings allow the user to make a link request as a current user as to act upon behalf and impersonate another user. (Col 9 lines 41-55, Col 12 lines 26-55, Figure 4)

As per claims 4, 22 and 40, Beckman et al. discloses the method of claim 3 in which the link request is embedded in a stored object; A pointer serves as a link request embedded in the object. (Col 8 lines 48-51)

As per claims 5, 23, and 41, Beckman et al. discloses the method of claim 4 in which the stored object is selected from the list consisting of: a procedure, a function, a view, a trigger. (Col 8 lines 2-6, Figure 2 items 104, 116, 117, 118)

As per claims 6, 24, and 42, Beckman et al. discloses the method of claim 1 in which the second network node comprises a list of untrusted nodes, wherein the link between the first network node and the second network node is not established if the list of untrusted nodes indicates that the first network node is untrusted. (Col 14 lines 43-59, Figure 11 items 574, 578)

As per claims 7, 25, and 43, Beckman et al. discloses the method of claim 1 in which the data object that indicates whether the domain permits links between nodes without verification of user credentials is a flag in a domain object corresponding to the domain; The binary standards serves the function for a flag as in the values of "1" or "0" (Col 7 lines 48-51)

As per claims 8 and 26, Beckman et al. discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising a second domain; Second domain is inherent to the enterprise-wide

Art Unit: 2141

computer networks (Col 6 lines 56-59) having a third network node, (Figure 5A item 322) in which a second link request is sent from the first network node to the third network node, wherein an act of establishing a network link between the first network node and the third network is made only upon verification of user credentials; (Col 10 lines 3-8, Figure 5A items 302, 312, 322)

As per claims 9 and 27, Beckman et al. discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising a second domain ; Second domain is inherent to the enterprise-wide computer networks (Col 6 lines 56-59) having a third network node, in which a second link request is sent from the first network node to the third network node, wherein an act of establishing a network link between the first network node and the third network is made without verification of user credentials; (Col 11 lines 48-50, Col 11 line 61, Figure 5A items 302, 312, 322).

As per claims 10, 28, and 44, Beckman et al. discloses the method of claim 1 in which mutual authentication occurs between the first network node and the second network node. (Col 10 lines 3-8, Figure 5A items 302, 312)

As per claims 11, 29, and 45, Beckman et al. disclose the method of claim 1 in which the first network node passes information to the second network node regarding a prior chain of links related to the link request. (Col 9 lines 65-67, Col 10 lines 1- 8)

Art Unit: 2141

As per claims 12, 30, and 46, Beckman et al. discloses the method of claim 11 in which the information regarding the prior chain of links comprises identification of all previous users in the prior chain of links. (Figure 5B item 342, 344, 346).

As per claims 13, 31, and 47, Beckman et al. discloses the method of claim 11 in which the information regarding the prior chain of links comprises identification of previous nodes in prior related links; The identity information provides the identification of the previous nodes in prior related links. (Figure 5B item 342, 344, 346)

As per claims 14, 32, and 48, Beckman et al. discloses the method of claim 11 in which a last entry in the information is checked for an untrusted user/node combination. (Col 14 lines 43-59)

As per claims 15, 33, and 49, Beckman et al. discloses the method of claim 14 in which trusted user/node combinations are maintained at a central authority. (Col 14 lines 60-65, Figure 12A, 12B, 12C)

As per claims 16, 34 and 50, Beckman et al. discloses the method of claim 15 in which the central authority is the directory; The catalog serves as the directory. (Col 14 lines 60-65, Col 15 lines 7-18, Figure 12A, 12B, 12C)

As per claims 17 and 35, Beckman et al. discloses the method of claim 14 in which untrusted combinations are stored in a database. (Col 14 lines 60-65, Figure 12A, 12B, 12C)

As per claims 18 and 36, Beckman et al. discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising: establishing the link between the first network node and the second network node only upon verification of the user credentials if the data object indicates that user credentials are required; (Col 10 lines 3-7, Col 10 lines 14-17)

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2141

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. These references are disclosed in the Notices of References cited page and teach numerous methods and system for implementing current user links. A close review of these references is recommended.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chirag R. Patel whose telephone number is (571)272-7966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://paired.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).


RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER